

**ITEM \_\_\_\_\_**  
**DRAFT STAFF ANALYSIS**  
**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE**  
**PARAMETERS AND GUIDELINES**

Government Code Sections 3301, 3303, 3304, 3305, 3306

As Added and Amended by Statutes 1976, Chapter 465; Statutes 1978, Chapters 775, 1173,  
1174, and 1178; Statutes 1979, Chapter 405; Statutes 1980, Chapter 1367;  
Statutes 1982, Chapter 994; Statutes 1983, Chapter 964;  
Statutes 1989, Chapter 1165; and Statutes 1990, Chapter 675

Directed by Government Code Section 3313, as added by  
Statutes 2005, Chapter 72 (Assem. Bill No. 138, § 6, eff. July 19 2005)

***Peace Officers Procedural Bill of Rights (POBOR)<sup>1</sup>***

California State Association of Counties, City of Sacramento, County of Los Angeles  
County of San Bernardino, Department of Finance, and State Controller's Office, Requestors

05-PGA-18, 05-PGA-19, 05-PGA-20, 05-PGA-21, and 05-PGA-22  
(CSM-4499 and 05-RL-4499-01)

---

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Executive Summary will be included in the Final Staff Analysis.

---

---

<sup>1</sup> Staff substituted the acronym "POBOR" throughout this document for all variations used in requests, comments, and other filings from interested parties and affected state agencies.



## STAFF ANALYSIS

### Requestors

California State Association of Counties  
County of Los Angeles  
County of San Bernardino  
Department of Finance  
State Controller's Office

### Chronology

11/30/1999	Commission on State Mandates (Commission) adopts original Statement of Decision
07/27/2000	Commission adopts parameters and guidelines
03/29/2001	Commission adopts statewide cost estimate
10/15/2003	Bureau of State Audits issues report on Peace Officers' Procedural Bill of Rights (commonly referred to as POBOR) and Animal Adoption Programs, Report No. 2003-106
05/05/2005	State Controller's Office files proposed amendments to the parameters and guidelines
07/19/2005	AB 138 (Statutes 2005, chapter 72) becomes effective, directing the Commission to reconsider the original POBOR Statement of Decision by July 1, 2006
04/26/2006	Commission reconsiders POBOR test claim, adopts statement of decision, and directs staff to work with state agencies and interested parties to develop and recommend a reasonable reimbursement methodology pursuant to Government Code section 17518.5 for inclusion in the revised parameters and guidelines <sup>2</sup>
05/23/2006	County of Los Angeles files proposed amendments to the parameters and guidelines
05/25/2006	Commission staff holds first prehearing conference
05/25/2006	California State Association of Counties files proposed amendments to the parameters and guidelines <sup>3</sup>
06/15/2006	County of Los Angeles files proposed amendments to the parameters and guidelines to replace and supersede proposed amendments filed on May 23, 2006 <sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See Exhibit A.

<sup>3</sup> See Exhibit B.

<sup>4</sup> See Exhibit C.

06/15/2006	County of San Bernardino files proposed amendments to parameters and guidelines. <sup>5</sup>
06/29/2006	Department of Finance files proposed amendments to parameters and guidelines. <sup>6</sup>
06/29/2006	State Controller's Office files proposed amendment to parameters and guidelines to supersede amendment previously filed on May 5, 2005. <sup>7</sup>
7/27/2006	Commission staff holds second prehearing conference. <sup>8</sup>
08/04/2006	County of Los Angeles files comments. City of Sacramento files comments. Department of Finance files comments. State Controller's Office files comments. <sup>9</sup>
08/17/2006	County of Los Angeles files rebuttal comments. Department of Finance files rebuttal comments. <sup>10</sup>
08/31/2006	Commission issues draft staff analysis and proposed amendments to parameters and guidelines, as modified by staff. <sup>11</sup>

### **Summary of the Mandate**

On November 30, 1999, the Commission approved the test claim and adopted the original Statement of Decision on the POBOR program. The Commission found that certain procedural requirements under POBOR were rights already provided to public employees under the due process clause of the United States and California Constitutions. Thus, the Commission denied the procedural requirements of POBOR that were already required by law on the ground that they did not impose a new program or higher level of service, or impose costs mandated by the state pursuant to Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c). Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c), generally provides that the Commission shall not find costs mandated by the state for test claim statutes that implement a federal law, unless the test claim statute mandates costs that exceed the federal mandate. The Commission approved the activities required by POBOR that exceeded the requirements of existing state and federal law.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Exhibit D.

<sup>6</sup> See Exhibit E.

<sup>7</sup> See Exhibit F.

<sup>8</sup> See Exhibit G.

<sup>9</sup> See Exhibit H for all comments.

<sup>10</sup> See Exhibit I for all rebuttal comments.

<sup>11</sup> See Exhibit J.

On July 27, 2000, the Commission adopted parameters and guidelines that authorized reimbursement, beginning July 1, 1994, to counties, cities, a city and county, school districts, and special districts that employ peace officers for the ongoing activities summarized below:

- Developing or updating policies and procedures.
- Training for human resources, law enforcement, and legal counsel.
- Updating the status of cases.
- Providing the opportunity for an administrative appeal for permanent, at-will, and probationary employees that were subject to certain disciplinary actions that were not covered by the due process clause of state and federal law.
- When a peace officer is under investigation, or becomes a witness to an incident under investigation, and is subjected to an interrogation by the employer that could lead to certain disciplinary actions, the following costs and activities are eligible for reimbursement: compensation to the peace officer for interrogations occurring during off-duty time; providing prior notice to the peace officer regarding the nature of the interrogation and identification of investigating officers; tape recording the interrogation; providing the peace officer employee with access to the tape prior to any further interrogation at a subsequent time or if any further specified proceedings are contemplated; and producing transcribed copies of any notes made by a stenographer at an interrogation, and copies of complaints of reports or complaints made by investigators.
- Performing certain activities, specified by the type of local agency or school district, upon the receipt of an adverse comment against a peace officer employee.

A technical correction was made to the parameters and guidelines on August 17, 2000.

In 2005, Statutes 2005, chapter 72, section 6 (AB 138) added section 3313 to the Government Code to direct the Commission to “review” the Statement of Decision, adopted in 1999, on POBOR to clarify whether the subject legislation imposed a mandate consistent with California Supreme Court Decision in *San Diego Unified School Dist. v. Commission on State Mandates* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859 and other applicable court decisions.

On April 26, 2006, the Commission reviewed its original findings and adopted a Statement of Decision on reconsideration (05-RL-4499-01). The Statement of Decision on reconsideration became final on May 1, 2006. On review of the claim, the Commission found that the *San Diego Unified School Dist.* case supports the Commission’s 1999 Statement of Decision, which found that the POBOR legislation constitutes a state-mandated program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the California Constitution for counties, cities, school districts, and special districts identified in Government Code section 3301 that employ peace officers.

The Commission further found that the *San Diego Unified School Dist.* case supports the Commission’s 1999 Statement of Decision that the test claim legislation constitutes a partial reimbursable state-mandated program within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6 of the

California Constitution and Government Code section 17514 for all activities previously approved by the Commission except the following:

- The activity of providing the opportunity for an administrative appeal to probationary and at-will peace officers (except when the chief of police is removed) pursuant to Government Code section 3304 is no longer a reimbursable state-mandated activity because the Legislature amended Government Code section 3304 in 1998. The amendment limited the right to an administrative appeal to only those peace officers “who successfully completed the probationary period that may be required” by the employing agency and to situations where the chief of police is removed. (Stats. 1998, ch. 786, § 1.)
- The activities of obtaining the signature of the peace officer on the adverse comment or noting the officer’s refusal to sign the adverse comment, pursuant to Government Code sections 3305 and 3306, when the adverse comment results in a punitive action protected by the due process clause<sup>12</sup> does not constitute a new program or higher level of service and does not impose costs mandated by the state pursuant to Government Code section 17556, subdivision (c).

The Statement of Decision adopted by the Commission on this reconsideration applies to costs incurred and claimed for the 2006-2007 fiscal year.

### **Proposed Amendments to the Parameters and Guidelines**

The Commission received five proposed amendments to the parameters and guidelines, filed by the California State Association of Counties, the County of Los Angeles, the County of San Bernardino, the Department of Finance, and the State Controller's Office, as follows:

The *California State Association of Counties* (05-PGA-19) requests that the parameters and guidelines be amended to include a reasonable reimbursement methodology that would reimburse local agencies \$528/peace officer employed by the agency on January 1 of the claim year, with annual adjustments based on the Implicit Price Deflator.

The *County of Los Angeles* (05-PGA-18) requests that the parameters and guidelines be amended to include a reasonable reimbursement methodology that would allow local agencies to be reimbursed based on *approximations of local costs mandated by the state*. This proposal is based on studies of claims data submitted to the Controller's Office for the 2001-2002 through 2004-2005 fiscal years. The County of Los Angeles describes its proposal as a reimbursement formula which reflects differences in POBOR case loads among local law enforcement agencies and differences in the numbers of peace officers employed by those agencies. The reasonable reimbursement methodology is comprised of three components: (1) *Unit Case Costs* are determined by multiplying (the number of unit level cases) X (12 standard hours) X (productive hourly rate); (2) *Extended Case Costs* are determined by multiplying (the number of extended

---

<sup>12</sup> Due process attaches when a permanent employee is dismissed, demoted, suspended, receives a reduction in salary, or receives a written reprimand. Due process also attaches when the charges supporting a dismissal of a probationary or at-will employee constitute moral turpitude that harms the employee’s reputation and ability to find future employment and, thus, a name-clearing hearing is required.

cases) X (162 standard hours) X (productive hourly rate); and (3) Uniform Costs are determined by multiplying (the number of peace officers) X (standard rate of \$100). The costs from these three components are then totaled for the annual claim amount.

The ***County of San Bernardino*** (05-PGA-20) requests that the parameters and guidelines be amended to allow claimants to file reimbursement claims based on actual costs or the CSAC-SB 90 Group reasonable reimbursement methodology proposal of \$528/peace officer. The County of San Bernardino also proposes amendments to: (1) update the parameters and guidelines based on the reconsideration; (2) clarify the descriptions of "Interrogations" and "Adverse Comment" under Section IV. Reimbursable Activities; and (3) update and clarify Sections V. through X. to conform with recently adopted language.

The ***Department of Finance (DOF)*** (05-PGA-22) requests that the parameters and guidelines be amended to include a reasonable reimbursement methodology. Under this methodology, a distinct "base rate" would be calculated for each claimant based on the State Controller's audited amounts for four years of claims. The annual reimbursement would be the result of multiplying the "base rate" by the number of covered officers. The base rates would be adjusted annually by an appropriate factor to capture the normal cost increases. A process for determining *mean* reimbursement rates while final reimbursement rates are determined.

The ***State Controller's Office (SCO)*** (05-PGA-21) requests that the parameters and guidelines amendment previously filed on May 5, 2005, be superseded by their June 29, 2006 filing. The SCO proposes changes to clarify reimbursable activities consistent with the Statement of Decision adopted November 30, 1999, and to add the Commission's previously adopted standardized language and "time study" language. The proposed amendments do not include changes reflected in the Commission's Statement of Decision adopted April 26, 2006.

## **Discussion**

Staff reviewed the proposed amendments to the parameters and guidelines and the comments received. Non-substantive technical changes were made for purposes of clarification, consistency with language in recently adopted parameters and guidelines, and conformity to the Statement of Decision on reconsideration and statutory language. Substantive changes were considered, and if appropriate, were made as follows.

## **Section IV. REIMBURSABLE ACTIVITIES**

The SCO requests that the parameters and guidelines be amended to include language authorizing the use of time studies to support salary and benefit costs for task-repetitive activities. The SCO's proposed language states the following:

Claimants may use time studies to support salary and benefit costs when an activity is task-repetitive. Time study usage is subject to the time study guidelines included in the State Controller's annual claiming instructions. If the claimant performs a time study, the claimant should separately study Unit Level cases and Internal Affairs cases, as their caseloads are significantly different in size, type, complexity, duration, and volume.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> SCO proposal of June 29, 2006, page 2.

The DOF generally agrees with the use of time studies. No other comments have been received from local agencies or school districts on the time study proposal.

When BSA audited this program, BSA recognized that there may be instances when it is impractical to maintain source documents with the level of detail needed to identify actual costs. In such cases, BSA acknowledged that a properly prepared and documented time study may be a reasonable substitute for actual time sheets. BSA concluded, however, that none of the claims of the four local entities reviewed by BSA used an adequate time study.<sup>14</sup> Claimants based the amount of time they claimed on interviews and informal estimates developed after the related activities were performed.<sup>15</sup>

BSA describes the key elements to an adequate time study as follows:

Key elements of an adequate time study include having employees who are conducting the reimbursable activities track the actual time they spend when they are conducting each activity, recording the activities over a reasonable period of time, maintaining documentation that reflects the results, and periodically considering whether the results continue to be representative of current processes.<sup>16</sup>

Based on the BSA recommendation, staff has included the following language under Section IV. Reimbursable Activities:

Claimants may use time studies to support salary and benefit costs when an activity is task-repetitive. Time study usage is subject to the review and audit conducted by the State Controller's Office.

#### **Section IV. A, Administrative Activities**

##### **Section IV. A (2)**

Section IV. A (2) currently authorizes reimbursement for the following activity: "Attendance at specific training for human resources, law enforcement, and legal counsel regarding the requirements of the mandate."

SCO requests the addition of the following sentence to Section IV. A (2): "The training must relate to mandate-reimbursable activities."

Staff finds that the proposed language is consistent with the Commission's findings when adopting the parameters and guidelines by limiting reimbursement for training "regarding the requirements of the mandate." Thus, staff recommends that the Commission add the proposed language to Section IV. A (2).

##### **Section IV. A (3)**

Section IV. A (3) currently states the following: "Updating the status of the POBOR cases."

---

<sup>14</sup> Administrative Record, pp. 1455-1456.

<sup>15</sup> Administrative Record, p. 1453.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*



SCO requests that Section IV. A (3) be amended as follows (proposed language is underlined):

Updating the status report of mandate-reimbursable POBOR cases. The updating relates to tracking the procedural status of cases. It does not relate to maintaining or updating the cases (e.g. setting up, reviewing, evaluating, or closing the cases).

In response to the SCO proposal, the City of Sacramento filed comments contending that the proposal is too narrow because of the time constraints imposed by the POBOR legislation. The City states the following:

The proposal concerning administrative activities and updating the cases is much too narrowly drawn. There are strict time constraints imposed by POBOR: if the time limits are not met, the case must be dismissed and no discipline can be imposed. Therefore, not only must the case filed be updated, but they must be reviewed in order to make sure that all deadlines have been met. To restrict the language as desired by the Controller would make it next to impossible to assure that the time limits set forth in POBOR are met. In order to make sure that the time lines are met, the case must be reviewed at various points in order to make sure that all investigations are completed, as well as to make sure all interrogations are completed timely. This is reasonably necessary in order to make sure that the time lines are met.

Staff finds that the City's comments go beyond the scope of the test claim legislation and are not consistent with the Commission's findings in the Statement of Decision on reconsideration. As indicated in footnote 5, page 6 of the Commission's Statement of Decision on reconsideration (05-RL-4499-01), the POBOR Act has been subsequently amended by the Legislature. One of those amendments imposed the time limitations described by the City.<sup>17</sup> The subsequent amendments were not pled in this test claim and, thus, they were not analyzed to determine whether they impose reimbursable state-mandated activities within the meaning of article XIII B, section 6. The City's arguments relating to the time limitations imposed by subsequent legislation are outside the scope of the Commission's decision in POBOR (CSM 4499). Thus, the City's rationale is not consistent with the Commission's findings.

Staff further finds that the SCO proposal is consistent with the Commission's findings when it adopted the parameters and guidelines. The Commission adopted the following finding:

Before the test claim legislation was enacted, local law enforcement agencies were conducting investigations, issuing disciplinary actions, and maintaining files for those cases. Thus, the component "maintenance of the systems to conduct the mandated activities" is too broad. Accordingly, staff has modified this component to provide that claimants are eligible for reimbursement for "updating the status report of the POBOR cases."<sup>18</sup>

Thus, staff has added the following proposed language to Section IV. C (3):

---

<sup>17</sup> Statutes 1997, chapter 148.

<sup>18</sup> Item 10, July 27, 2000 Commission Hearing (Administrative Record ("AR"), p. 901.)

Updating the status report of the mandate-reimbursable POBOR cases. “Updating the status report of mandate-reimbursable POBOR cases” means tracking the procedural status of cases only. Reimbursement is not required to maintain or update the cases, set up the cases, review the cases, evaluate the cases, or close the cases.

#### **Section IV. B, Administrative Appeal**

Government Code section 3304 gives specified officers the right to request an administrative appeal when any punitive action is taken against the officer, or the officer is denied promotion on grounds other than merit.

As indicated on page 30 of the Commission’s Statement of Decision on reconsideration (05-RL-4499-01), the Legislature amended Government Code section 3304 in 1998 by limiting the right to an administrative appeal to only those peace officers “who [have] successfully completed the probationary period that may be required” by the employing agency and to situations where the chief of police is removed. (Stats. 1998, ch. 786, § 1.) Thus, as of January 1, 1999, providing the opportunity for an administrative appeal to probationary and at-will peace officers (except when the chief of police is removed) is no longer a reimbursable state-mandated activity. Therefore, staff proposes that Section IV. B be amended to clarify that the right to an administrative appeal applies only to permanent peace officers, as specifically defined in Government Code section 3301,<sup>19</sup> and to chiefs of police that are removed from office.

The SCO further requests that the last paragraph in Section IV. B (1) and (2) be amended to clarify that reimbursement for the administrative appeal begins only after the peace officer requests an administrative appeal, and does not include the costs for the investigation or preparation of charges that were incurred before the officer requested the appeal. SCO further proposes to clarify that litigation costs incurred in any court challenge to the administrative decision are not reimbursable. The SCO proposal is as follows:

~~Included in the~~ The foregoing includes only ~~are~~ the preparation and review of the various documents necessary to commence and proceed with the administrative appeal hearing; exclusive of prior preparation, review, and investigation costs. This includes legal review and assistance with the conduct of the administrative hearing; preparation and service of subpoenas, witness fees, and salaries of employee witnesses, including overtime; the time and labor of the administrative body and its attendant clerical services; the preparation and service of any rulings or orders of the administrative body. The foregoing does not include activities such as writing and reviewing charges that occurred before the officer requested an administrative appeal or defending a lawsuit attacking the validity of the final administrative decision.

---

<sup>19</sup> Pursuant to Government Code section 3301, POBOR applies to peace officers as defined in Penal Code sections 830.1, 830.2, 830.3, 830.31, 830.32, 830.33, except subdivision (e), 830.34, 830.35, except subdivision (c), 830.36, 830.37, 830.4, and 830.5. POBOR does not apply to reserve or recruit officers, coroners, railroad police officers commissioned by the Governor, or non-sworn officers including custodial officers and sheriff or police security officers. (*Burden v. Snowden* (1992) 2 Cal.4th 556, 569; Government Code section 3301; Penal Code sections 831, 831.4.)

In response to the SCO request, the City of Sacramento argues that:

This proposal is much too narrowly drawn. Administrative appeal applies only to those situations where a hearing is not required by *Skelly*. Accordingly, prior preparation, review and investigative costs are necessary. Absent POBOR, these hearings would not take place at all. Thus, investigation and case preparation is imperative. So, too, defense of litigation is also reasonably necessary. If the employer wins at the administrative level and the employee wishes to contest, the only alternative is litigation.

For the reasons below, staff finds that the SCO proposal is consistent with the test claim legislation and the Commission's decisions. Staff has modified the proposal, however, to clarify the activities that are not reimbursable.

Government Code section 3304 gives the officer the right to request an administrative appeal when any punitive action is taken against the officer, or the officer is denied promotion on grounds other than merit.<sup>20</sup> The courts have concluded that the "limited purpose" of the administrative appeal is to provide the officer with a chance to establish a formal record of circumstances surrounding the punitive action and to attempt to convince the employing agency to reverse its decision.<sup>21</sup> Government Code section 3304 does not require an agency to investigate or impose disciplinary action against peace officer employees. When adopting the parameters and guidelines, the Commission concluded that:

Local agencies were issuing disciplinary actions before the test claim legislation was enacted. All that Government Code section 3304, subdivision (b), did was to require the local agency to provide the procedural protection of an administrative appeal for specified disciplinary actions.<sup>22</sup>

As determined by the Commission in the Statement of Decision on reconsideration: "POBOR deals with labor relations. It does not interfere with the employer's right to manage and control its own police department."<sup>23</sup> The Second District Court of Appeal also determined that POBOR is not intended to interfere with a local agency's right to regulate peace officers' qualifications for employment or the causes for which such peace officers may be removed.<sup>24</sup>

Thus, the SCO is correct in concluding that investigation costs, costs to prepare disciplinary charges, or costs to take punitive action against an officer are not reimbursable.

---

<sup>20</sup> See summary in *Baggett v. Gates* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 128, 135.

<sup>21</sup> *Riveros v. City of Los Angeles* (1996) 41 Cal.App.4th 1342, 1359.

<sup>22</sup> Item 10, July 27, 2000 Commission Hearing (AR, p. 903).

<sup>23</sup> Statement of Decision on reconsideration adopted April 26, 2006, page 39, citing to *Sulier v. State Personnel Bd.* (2004) 125 Cal.App.4th 21, 26, and *Baggett, supra*, 32 Cal.3d 128, 125.

<sup>24</sup> *Binkley v. City of Long Beach* (1993) 16 Cal.App.4th 1795, 1806.

Moreover, the SCO's request to clarify that litigation costs are not reimbursable is consistent with the Commission's findings when it adopted the parameters and guidelines, expressly denying reimbursement for litigation costs.<sup>25</sup>

Thus, proposed Section IV. B, Administrative Activities, states the following:

B. Administrative Appeal

1. ~~Reimbursement period of July 1, 1994 through December 31, 1998—~~ The administrative appeal activities listed below apply to permanent peace officer employees, ~~at will employees, and probationary employees.~~ as defined in Penal Code sections 830.1, 830.2, 830.3, 830.31, 830.32, 830.33, except subdivision (e), 830.34, 830.35, except subdivision (c), 830.36, 830.37, 830.4, and 830.5. The administrative appeal activities do not apply to reserve or recruit officers, coroners, railroad police officers commissioned by the Governor, or non-sworn officers including custodial officers and sheriff or police security officers.

The following activities and costs are reimbursable:

- a. Providing the opportunity for, and the conduct of an administrative appeal hearing for the following disciplinary actions (Gov. Code, § 3304, subd. (b)):
  - dismissal, demotion, suspension, salary reduction or written reprimand received by probationary and at-will employees whose liberty interests are not affected (i.e.: the charges supporting a dismissal do not harm the employee's reputation or ability to find future employment);
  - transfer of permanent, probationary and at-will employees for purposes of punishment;
  - denial of promotion for permanent, probationary and at-will employees for reasons other than merit; and
  - other actions against permanent, probationary and at-will employees that result in disadvantage, harm, loss or hardship and impact the career opportunities of the employee.
- b. Preparation and review of the various documents necessary to commence and proceed with the administrative appeal hearing.
- c. Legal review and assistance with the conduct of the administrative appeal hearing.
- d. Preparation and service of subpoenas.
- e. Preparation and service of any rulings or orders of the administrative appeal hearing body.
- f. The cost of witness fees.
- g. The cost of salaries of employee witnesses, including overtime, the time and labor of the administrative appeal hearing body and its attendant clerical services.

---

<sup>25</sup> Item 10, July 27, 2000 Commission hearing (AR, pp. 901-905).

~~Included in the foregoing are the preparation and review of the various documents to commence and proceed with the administrative hearing; legal review and assistance with the conduct of the administrative hearing; preparation and service of subpoenas, witness fees, and salaries of employee witnesses, including overtime; the time and labor of the administrative body and its attendant clerical services; the preparation and service of any rulings or orders of the administrative body.~~

The following activities are **not** reimbursable:

- a. Investigating charges.
  - b. Writing and reviewing charges.
  - c. Imposing disciplinary or punitive action against the peace officer.
  - d. Litigating the final administrative decision.
2. ~~Reimbursement period beginning January 1, 1999— The administrative appeal activities listed below apply to permanent employees and the Chief of Police.~~

~~Providing the opportunity for, and the conduct of an administrative appeal for the following disciplinary actions hearing for removal of the chief of police under circumstances that do not create a liberty interest (i.e., the charges do not constitute moral turpitude, which harms the employee's reputation and ability to find future employment).~~  
(Gov. Code, § 3304, subd. (b)):

- ~~• Dismissal, demotion, suspension, salary reduction or written reprimand received by the Chief of Police whose liberty interest is not affected (i.e.: the charges supporting a dismissal do not harm the employee's reputation or ability to find future employment);~~
- ~~• Transfer of permanent employees for purposes of punishment;~~
- ~~• Denial of promotion for permanent employees for reasons other than merit; and~~
- ~~• Other actions against permanent employees or the Chief of Police that result in disadvantage, harm, loss or hardship and impact the career opportunities of the employee.~~

~~Included in the foregoing are the preparation and review of the various documents to commence and proceed with the administrative hearing; legal review and assistance with the conduct of the administrative hearing; preparation and service of subpoenas, witness fees, and salaries of employee witnesses, including overtime; the time and labor of the administrative body and its attendant clerical services; the preparation and service of any rulings or orders of the administrative body.~~

The following activities and costs are reimbursable:

- a. Preparation and review of the various documents necessary to commence and proceed with the administrative appeal hearing.
- b. Legal review and assistance with the conduct of the administrative appeal hearing.
- c. Preparation and service of subpoenas.

- d. Preparation and service of any rulings or orders of the administrative appeal hearing body.
- e. The cost of witness fees.
- f. The cost of salaries of employee witnesses, including overtime, the time and labor of the administrative appeal hearing body and its attendant clerical services.

The following activities are **not** reimbursable:

- a. Investigating charges.
- b. Writing and reviewing charges.
- c. Imposing disciplinary or punitive action against the chief of police.
- d. Litigating the final administrative decision.

## **Section IV. C, Interrogations**

### **Introductory Paragraphs in Section IV. C**

Government Codes section 3303 prescribes procedural protections that apply when a peace officer is interrogated in the course of an administrative investigation that might subject the officer to the punitive actions listed in the section (dismissal, demotion, suspension, reduction in salary, written reprimand, or transfer for purposes of punishment). The introductory paragraphs to Section IV. C of the parameters and guidelines state the following:

Claimants are eligible for reimbursement for the performance of the activities listed in this section only when a peace officer is under investigation, or becomes a witness to an incident under investigation, and is subjected to an interrogation by the commanding officer, or any other member of the employing public safety department, that could lead to dismissal, demotion, suspension, reduction in salary, written reprimand, or transfer for purposes of punishment. (Gov. Code, § 3303.)

Claimants are not eligible for reimbursement for the activities listed in this section when an interrogation of a peace officer is in the normal course of duty, counseling, instruction, or informal verbal admonishment by, or other routine or unplanned contact with, a supervisor or any other public safety officer. Claimants are also not eligible for reimbursement when the investigation is concerned solely and directly with alleged criminal activities. (Gov. Code, § 3303, subd. (i).)

The SCO proposes the addition of the following three paragraphs to the introduction to clarify that the costs to investigate and review the allegations, costs to conduct the interrogation, and case finalization costs are not reimbursable:

Claimants are not eligible for reimbursement for activities occurring prior to the assignment of the case to an administrative investigator, e.g., taking the initial complaint; setting up the complaint file; interviewing parties; or reviewing the file and determining whether it warrants an administrative investigation.

Claimants are not eligible for investigative activities, e.g., assigning an investigator, reviewing the allegation, communicating with other departments,

visiting the scene of the alleged incident, gathering evidence, identifying and contacting complainants and witnesses, preparing of the interrogation, reviewing and preparing interview questions, conducting the interrogation, or reviewing the responses given by the officers and/or witnesses.

Claimants are also not eligible for case finalization costs, e.g., preparing case summary disposition reports, closing the case file, or attending executive review or committee hearings related to the investigation.

The County of San Bernardino and the City of Sacramento contend that investigation costs and the cost to conduct the interrogation are reimbursable.

Staff finds that the SCO proposal is consistent with the Commission findings when adopting the parameters and guidelines and the Statement of Decision on reconsideration.

Government Code section 3303, subdivision (a), establishes the timing of the interrogation, and requires the employer to compensate the interrogated officer if the interrogation takes place during off-duty time. In other words, the statute defines the process that is due the peace officer who is subject to an interrogation. This statute does not require the employer to investigate and review complaints or to conduct interrogations. The Commission adopted the following findings when adopting the parameters and guidelines:

The Commission's Statement of Decision includes the following reimbursable activity:

Conducting an interrogation of a peace officer while the officer is on duty, or compensating the peace officer for off-duty time in accordance with regular department procedures. (Gov. Code, § 3303, subd. (a).)

This activity was derived from Government Code section 3303, subdivision (a), which establishes the timing and compensation of a peace officer subject to an interrogation. Section 3303, subdivision (a), requires that the interrogation be conducted at a reasonable hour, preferably at a time when the peace officer is on duty, or during the normal waking hours of the peace officer, unless the seriousness of the investigation requires otherwise. At the test claim phase, the claimant contended that this section resulted in the payment of overtime to the peace officer employee. (See page 12 of the Commission's Statement of Decision.)

The claimant's proposed parameters and guidelines restate the activity as expressed in the Statement of Decision, but also add "the review of the necessity for the questioning and responses given" as a reimbursable component. The claimant's proposed parameters and guidelines state the following:

Conducting an interrogation of a peace officer while the officer is on duty, or compensating the peace officer for off-duty time in accordance with regular department procedures. (Gov. Code, § 3303, subd. (a).)

Included in the foregoing, but not limited thereto, is the *review of the necessity for the questioning and responses given*; providing notice to all parties concerned of the time and place of the interview and scheduling

thereof; preparation and review of overtime compensation requests; review of proceedings by counsel. (Emphasis added.)

Following the pre-hearing conference in this case, staff requested further comments on the proposed activity “to review the necessity for the questioning and responses given” to determine if the activity was consistent with, and/or reasonably related to, the Commission’s Statement of Decision and the activities mandated by the test claim legislation.

In response to staff’s request, the claimant asserts that it is more difficult to prepare for an investigation under POBOR because Government Code section 3303, subdivision (c), requires that the employee receive prior notice identifying the nature and subject of the questioning. The claimant states the following:

It is more difficult to prepare for an investigation involving a peace officer than it is for those who are not entitled to POBOR rights. In the normal due process case involving an employee who is not entitled to POBOR rights, you do not have to inform the employee about the nature and subject of the questioning, and you do not have to prepare questions focused upon a particular area, seeking to get the information you can from the employee. In non-POBOR matters, you can explore other areas in the questioning as they arise, which allows for a much more free-form questioning process.

In contrast, however, with employees covered by POBOR, you must tell the employee prior to the initial questioning what the purpose of the meeting is, what it is you will be discussing with him or her, and you have to be prepared to be clearly on point as to where you are going and your expectations about the questioning process. You cannot engage in broader questioning for information, because the employee has the right to know the subject about which he or she is being interrogated. [Footnote omitted.]

The claimant further states the following:

As any peace officer who is a witness in the course of one individual’s investigation could become the subject of their own investigation, it is imperative to do more preparation prior to the initial questioning. We now perform a more complete review to ascertain that witnesses who may become subjects are identified prior to interrogation. . . .

Obviously, if you are going to re-interview a peace officer, you have to be prepared to give them a copy of their prior transcript. You also have to go back and review it, to make sure where conflicts with what transpired previously in order to ask intelligent questions. In a non-POBOR matter, you can follow up by asking additional questions without regard to the reasons you have the employee in for questioning in the first place. However, with POBOR, the whole questioning is focused on what you have identified as the allegation. Thus, the definition of what the allegations are must come early in the process. If someone calls to



complain about something, the subsequent investigation may bring to light little about the complaint of the citizen, but may demonstrate an internal operating problem or conflict which you have to address. The additional rights granted by POBOR make that more difficult as indicated above.  
[Footnote omitted.]

Staff finds that the activity to review the necessity for the questioning and responses given is too broad and goes beyond the scope of Government Code section 3303, subdivision (a), and the Commission's Statement of Decision.

Government Code section 3303, subdivision (a), addresses only the compensation and timing of the interrogation. It does not require local agencies to investigate an allegation, prepare for the interrogation, conduct the interrogation, and review the responses given by the officers and/or witnesses, as implied by the claimant's proposed language. Certainly, local agencies were performing these investigative activities before POBOR was enacted.<sup>26</sup>

In the Statement of Decision on reconsideration, the Commission concluded that the POBOR activities are not triggered until the local agency or school district decides to interrogate the officer, take punitive action against the officer, or place an adverse comment in the officer's personnel file. These initial decisions are not expressly mandated by state law, but are governed by local policy, ordinance, city charter, or memorandum of understanding.<sup>27</sup> In *Baggett v. Gates*, the Supreme Court clarified that POBOR *does not*: (1) interfere with the setting of peace officers' compensation; (2) regulate qualifications for employment; (3) regulate the manner, method, times, or terms for which a peace officer shall be elected or appointed; or (4) affect the tenure of office or purpose to regulate or specify the causes for which a peace officer can be removed. These are local decisions. The court found that POBOR only impinges on the local entity's implied power to determine the *manner* in which an employee can be disciplined.<sup>28</sup>

On pages 38 and 39 of the Statement of Decision on reconsideration, the Commission expressly concluded that conducting the interrogation and investigative time are *not* reimbursable:

In comments to the draft staff analysis, the Counties of Orange, Los Angeles, and Alameda, and the City of Sacramento contend that the interrogation of an officer pursuant to the test claim legislation is complicated and requires the employer to fully investigate in order to prepare for the interrogation. The County of Orange further states that "[t]hese investigations can vary in scope and depth from abuses of authority, the use of deadly force, excessive force when injuries may be significant, serious property damage, and criminal behavior." These local agencies are requesting reimbursement for the time to investigate.

The Commission disagrees and finds that investigation services are not reimbursable. First, investigation of criminal behavior is specifically excluded

---

<sup>26</sup> Item 10, July 27, 2000 Commission Hearing (AR, p. 911-912).

<sup>27</sup> Statement of Decision on reconsideration, page 14.

<sup>28</sup> *Baggett v. Gates* (1982) 32 Cal.3d 128, 137-140.

from the requirements of Government Code section 3303. Government Code section 3303, subdivision (i), states that the interrogation requirements do not apply to an investigation concerned solely and directly with alleged criminal activities. Moreover, article XIII B, section 6, subdivision (a)(2), and Government Code section 17556, subdivision (g), state that no reimbursement is required for the enforcement of a crime.

The County of Los Angeles supports the argument that reimbursement for investigative services is required by citing Penal Code section 832.5, which states that each department that employs peace officers shall establish a procedure to investigate complaints. Penal Code section 832.5, however, was not included in this test claim, and the Commission makes no findings on that statute. The County of Los Angeles also cites to the phrase in Government Code section 3303, subdivision (a), which states that “[t]he interrogation shall be conducted ...” to argue that investigation is required. The County takes the phrase out of context. Government Code section 3303, subdivision (a), states the following:

The interrogation shall be conducted at a reasonable hour, preferably at a time when the public safety officer is on duty, or during the normal waking hours for the public safety officer, unless the seriousness of the investigation requires otherwise. If the interrogation does occur during off-duty time of the public safety officer being interrogated, the public safety officer shall be compensated for any off-duty time in accordance with regular department procedures, and the public safety officer shall not be released from employment for any work missed.

Government Code section 3303, subdivision (a), establishes the timing of the interrogation, and requires the employer to compensate the interrogated officer if the interrogation takes place during off-duty time. In other words, the statute defines the process that is due the peace officer who is subject to an interrogation. This statute does not require the employer to investigate complaints. When adopting parameters and guidelines for this program, the Commission recognized that Government Code section 3303 does not impose new mandated requirements to investigate an allegation, prepare for the interrogation, conduct the interrogation, and review responses given by officers and/or witnesses to an investigation. [Footnote omitted.]

Thus, investigation services go beyond the scope of the test claim legislation and are **not** reimbursable. As explained by the courts, POBOR deals with labor relations. [Footnote omitted.] It does not interfere with the employer’s right to manage and control its own police department. [Footnote omitted.]

The findings made by the Commission in the Statement of Decision on reconsideration are final and are binding on the parties. It is a well-settled principle of law that an administrative agency

does not have jurisdiction to retry a question that has become final. If a prior decision is retried by the agency, that decision is void.<sup>29</sup>

Thus, staff finds that SCO's proposed language is consistent with the Commission's findings. Staff recommends, however, that the language proposed by the SCO be made more specific. Staff recommends that the first introductory paragraph be modified to incorporate that language of Government Code section 3301, which specifically identifies the officers entitled to the procedural protections under POBOR when the employing agency wants to interrogate the officer. The proposed paragraph states the following:

~~Claimants are eligible for reimbursement for t~~The performance of the activities listed in this section are eligible for reimbursement only when a peace officer, as defined in Penal Code sections 830.1, 830.2, 830.3, 830.31, 830.32, 830.33, except subdivision (e), 830.34, 830.35, except subdivision (c), 830.36, 830.37, 830.4, and 830.5, is under investigation, or becomes a witness to an incident under investigation, and is subjected to an interrogation by the commanding officer, or any other member of the employing public safety department, that could lead to dismissal, demotion, suspension, reduction in salary, written reprimand, or transfer for purposes of punishment. (Gov. Code, § 3303.)

In addition, staff has included the activities that are not reimbursable at the end of Section IV. C as following:

The following activities are **not** reimbursable:

1. Activities occurring before the assignment of the case to an administrative investigator. These activities include taking an initial complaint, setting up the complaint file, interviewing parties, reviewing the file, and determining whether the complaint warrants an administrative investigation.
2. Investigation activities, including assigning an investigator to the case, reviewing the allegation, communicating with other departments, visiting the scene of the alleged incident, gathering evidence, identifying and contacting complainants and witnesses.

---

<sup>29</sup> See, *Heap v. City of Los Angeles* (1936) 6 Cal.2d 405, 407, where the court held that the civil service commission had no jurisdiction to retry a question and make a different finding at a later time; *City and County of San Francisco v. Ang* (1979) 97 Cal.App.3d 673, 697, where the court held that whenever a quasi-judicial agency is vested with the authority to decide a question, such decision, when made, is res judicata, and as conclusive of the issues involved in the decision as though the adjudication had been made by the court; and *Save Oxnard Shores v. California Coastal Commission* (1986) 179 Cal.App.3d 140, 143, where the court held that in the absence of express statutory authority, an administrative agency may not change a determination made on the facts presented at a full hearing once the decision becomes final. The Commission's Statement of Decision on reconsideration became final when it was mailed or served on May 1, 2006. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 1188.2, subd. (b).)

3. Preparing for the interrogation, reviewing and preparing interrogation questions, conducting the interrogation, and reviewing the responses given by the officer and/or witness during the interrogation.
4. Closing the file, including the preparation of a case summary disposition reports and attending executive review or committee hearings related to the investigation.

#### **Section IV. C (1)**

Section IV. C (1) currently states the following:

1. When required by the seriousness of the investigation, compensating the peace officer for interrogations occurring during off-duty time in accordance with regular department procedures. (Gov. Code, § 3303, subd. (a).)

Included in the foregoing is the preparation and review of overtime compensation requests.

The SCO proposes the following amendments to clarify that the interrogators' time to conduct the interrogation is not reimbursable:

1. When required by the seriousness of the investigation, compensating the peace officer for interrogations occurring during off-duty time in accordance with regular department procedures. (Gov. Code, § 3303, subd. (a).) Interrogators' time is not reimbursable.

Included in the foregoing is the preparation and review of overtime compensation requests.

Claimants are not eligible for reimbursement under interrogation when a peace officer being investigated under POBOR is not subjected to an interview or interrogation, but is subject to possible sanctions.

The County of San Bernardino requests, on the other hand, that the parameters and guidelines be amended to authorize reimbursement for conducting the interrogation and the investigating officer's preparation time for the interrogation. The County of San Bernardino proposes the addition of the following italicized language:

*Conducting an interrogation of a peace officer while the officer is on duty, or compensating the peace officer for interrogations occurring during off-duty time in accordance with regular department procedures. (Gov. Code section 3303, subd. (a).)*

*Included in the foregoing is the investigating officer's preparation time for the interrogation. Preparation costs are reimbursable to a maximum of 20 hours with appropriate supporting documentation. Also included is the preparation and review of overtime compensation requests.*

Staff finds that SCO's proposed sentence that states, "Interrogators' time is not reimbursable" is consistent with the Commission's findings when adopting the parameters and guidelines. When the claimant submitted its proposed parameters and guidelines, it requested reimbursement for "conducting an interrogation of a peace officer while the officer is on duty."<sup>30</sup> The Commission

---

<sup>30</sup> Item 10, July 27, 2000 Commission Hearing (AR, p. 965.)

disagreed that conducting the interrogation was reimbursable. The Commission found that the test claim legislation does not require local agencies to investigate an allegation, prepare for the interrogation, conduct the interrogation, and review the responses given. Local agencies were conducting interrogations before the enactment of the test claim legislation.<sup>31</sup>

These findings were also included in the Statement of Decision on reconsideration. On pages 38 and 39 of the Statement of Decision on reconsideration, the Commission expressly concluded that conducting the interrogation and investigative time are *not* reimbursable:

In comments to the draft staff analysis, the Counties of Orange, Los Angeles, and Alameda, and the City of Sacramento contend that the interrogation of an officer pursuant to the test claim legislation is complicated and requires the employer to fully investigate in order to prepare for the interrogation. The County of Orange further states that “[t]hese investigations can vary in scope and depth from abuses of authority, the use of deadly force, excessive force when injuries may be significant, serious property damage, and criminal behavior.” These local agencies are requesting reimbursement for the time to investigate.

The Commission disagrees and finds that investigation services are not reimbursable. First, investigation of criminal behavior is specifically excluded from the requirements of Government Code section 3303. Government Code section 3303, subdivision (i), states that the interrogation requirements do not apply to an investigation concerned solely and directly with alleged criminal activities. Moreover, article XIII B, section 6, subdivision (a)(2), and Government Code section 17556, subdivision (g), state that no reimbursement is required for the enforcement of a crime.

The County of Los Angeles supports the argument that reimbursement for investigative services is required by citing Penal Code section 832.5, which states that each department that employs peace officers shall establish a procedure to investigate complaints. Penal Code section 832.5, however, was not included in this test claim, and the Commission makes no findings on that statute. The County of Los Angeles also cites to the phrase in Government Code section 3303, subdivision (a), which states that “[t]he interrogation shall be conducted ...” to argue that investigation is required. The County takes the phrase out of context. Government Code section 3303, subdivision (a), states the following:

The interrogation shall be conducted at a reasonable hour, preferably at a time when the public safety officer is on duty, or during the normal waking hours for the public safety officer, unless the seriousness of the investigation requires otherwise. If the interrogation does occur during off-duty time of the public safety officer being interrogated, the public safety officer shall be compensated for any off-duty time in accordance with regular department procedures, and the public safety officer shall not be released from employment for any work missed.

---

<sup>31</sup> Administrative Record, page 912.

Government Code section 3303, subdivision (a), establishes the timing of the interrogation, and requires the employer to compensate the interrogated officer if the interrogation takes place during off-duty time. In other words, the statute defines the process that is due the peace officer who is subject to an interrogation. This statute does not require the employer to investigate complaints. When adopting parameters and guidelines for this program, the Commission recognized that Government Code section 3303 does not impose new mandated requirements to investigate an allegation, prepare for the interrogation, conduct the interrogation, and review responses given by officers and/or witnesses to an investigation. [Footnote omitted.]

Thus, investigation services go beyond the scope of the test claim legislation and are *not* reimbursable. As explained by the courts, POBOR deals with labor relations. [Footnote omitted.] It does not interfere with the employer's right to manage and control its own police department. [Footnote omitted.]

These findings are binding on the parties.<sup>32</sup> Thus, staff has added the following proposed language at the end of Section IV. to identify the activities that are not reimbursable.

Preparing for the interrogation, reviewing and preparing interrogation questions, conducting the interrogation, and reviewing the responses given by the officer and/or witness during the interrogation.

However, staff finds that the SCO's second proposed sentence is vague and ambiguous, and may already be covered by the parameters and guidelines. The second proposed sentence states that: "Claimants are not eligible for reimbursement under interrogation when a peace officer being investigated under POBOR is not subjected to an interview or interrogation, but is subject to possible sanctions." The City of Sacramento argues that this sentence:

...makes no sense whatsoever. It may be possible during the investigation and interrogation of other officers to ascertain that the officer, who is the subject of the investigation, did not commit the misconduct at issue, but was done by another officer. If the interrogation involves a witness officer, to whom the POBOR rights attach, the interrogation should be compensable."

When adopting the parameters and guidelines, the Commission concluded that the rights under Government Code section 3303 attach when a peace officer is interrogated as a witness to an incident, even if the officer is not under investigation since the officer's own actions regarding the incident can result in punitive action following the interrogation.<sup>33</sup> Thus, the Commission included the following language in the parameters and guidelines:

Claimants are eligible for reimbursement for the performance of the activities listed in this section only when a peace officer is under investigation, *or becomes a witness to an incident under investigation, and is subjected to an interrogation by the commanding officer, or any other member of the employing public safety*

---

<sup>32</sup> *Heap, supra*, 6 Cal.2d 405, 407.

<sup>33</sup> Item 10, July 27, 2000 Commission Hearing (AR, pp. 908-910.)

*department, that could lead to dismissal, demotion, suspension, reduction in salary, written reprimand, or transfer for purposes of punishment. (Gov. Code, § 3303.) (Emphasis added.)*

Although the SCO's proposed language appears to clarify that reimbursement for the activities identified in the parameters and guidelines is not required when the peace officer witness is not subject to an interrogation, the italicized language above already addresses that issue. Thus, staff has not included the second proposed language in the parameters and guidelines.

Accordingly, staff proposes the following amendments to Section IV. (C)(1):

The following activities are reimbursable:

1. When required by the seriousness of the investigation, compensating the peace officer for interrogations occurring during off-duty time in accordance with regular department procedures. (Gov. Code, § 3303, subd. (a).)

~~Included in the foregoing is the p~~Preparation and review of overtime compensation requests are reimbursable.

**Section IV. C (2)**

Section IV. C (2) currently states the following:

2. Providing prior notice to the peace officer regarding the nature of the interrogation and identification of the investigating officers. (Gov. Code, § 3303, subs. (b) and (c).)

Included in the foregoing is the review of agency complaints or other documents to prepare the notice of interrogation; determination of the investigating officers; redaction of the agency complaint for names of the complainant or other accused parties or witnesses or confidential information; preparation of notice or agency complaint; review by counsel; and presentation of notice or agency complaint to peace officer.

The SCO requests the following amendments to the second paragraph:

Included in the foregoing is the review of agency complaints or other documents to prepare the notice of interrogation; identification ~~determination~~ of the investigating officers; redaction of the agency complaint for names of the complainant or other accused parties or witnesses or of other confidential information; preparation of notice or agency complaint; review by counsel; and presentation of notice or agency complaint to peace officer.

The City of Sacramento contends that the SCO proposal is too limited. The City argues that:

... it is imperative that it not be just the identification of the investigating officers, but determining who will, in fact, do the questioning. Often determining the investigating officer will have an impact on the outcome of the questioning. Accordingly, limiting the notice to just identifying the questioning officers is far too limited.

Staff agrees that the word “determination” is too broad and goes beyond the procedural protection required by Government Code section 3303, subdivisions (b) and (c). Subdivisions (b) and (c) require the employer, prior to interrogation, to inform and provide notice of the nature of the investigation and the “identity” of all officers participating in the interrogation. Government Code section 3303, subdivisions (b) and (c), state the following:

(b) The public safety officer under investigation shall be informed prior to the interrogation of the rank, name, and command of the officer in charge of the interrogation, the interrogating officers, and all other persons to be present during the interrogation. All questions directed to the public safety officer under interrogation shall be asked by and through no more than two interrogators at one time.

(c) The public safety officer under investigation shall be informed of the nature of the investigation prior to any interrogation.

The verb “determine” means “to establish or ascertain definitely, as after consideration, investigation, or calculation.”<sup>34</sup> To “identify” means “to establish the identity of.”<sup>35</sup> Government Code section 3303, subdivision (c), simply requires the agency to provide the officer with notice identifying the interrogating officers. It does not require the agency to investigate or determine who the officer will be. As determined by the Commission, Government Code section 3303 does not require the local agency to investigate an allegation, prepare for the interrogation, conduct the interrogation, or review the responses given.<sup>36</sup>

Thus, staff recommends that the Commission change the word “determination” to “identification” in the parameters and guidelines.

Staff also recommends the Commission delete the activities redacting the agency complaint for names of the complainant, parties, or witnesses, and preparing the agency complaint. These activities go beyond the scope of Government Code section 3303, subdivisions (c) and (d), and the Commission’s Statement of Decision finding that the activity of providing notice before the interrogation was reimbursable.

Accordingly, staff proposes the following amendments:

2. Providing ~~prior~~ notice to the peace officer before the interrogation. ~~regarding the nature of the interrogation and identification of the investigating officers.~~ (Gov. Code, § 3303, subds. (b) and (c).) The notice shall inform the peace officer of the rank, name, and command of the officer in charge of the interrogation, the interrogating officers, and all other persons to be present during the interrogation. The notice shall inform the peace officer of the nature of the investigation.

~~Included in the foregoing is the review of agency complaints or other documents to prepare the notice of interrogation; determination of the investigating officers;~~

---

<sup>34</sup> Webster’s II New College Dictionary, page 308.

<sup>35</sup> *Id.* at page 548.

<sup>36</sup> Statement of Decision on reconsideration, page 39.



~~redaction of the agency complaint for names of the complainant or other accused parties or witnesses or confidential information; preparation of notice or agency complaint; review by counsel; and presentation of notice or agency complaint to peace officer.~~

The following activities are reimbursable:

- a. Review of agency complaints or other documents to prepare the notice of interrogation.
- b. Identification of the interrogating officers to include in the notice of interrogation.
- c. Preparation of the notice.
- d. Review of the notice by counsel.
- e. Providing notice to the peace officer prior to interrogation.

#### **Section IV. C (3), (4), and (5)**

Section IV. C (3) states the following:

3. Tape recording the interrogation when the peace officer employee records the interrogation. (Gov. Code, § 3303, subd. (g).)

Included in the foregoing is the cost of tape and storage, and the cost of transcription.

The SCO proposes that Section IV. C (3) be amended as follows:

3. ~~Tape r~~Recording the interrogation when the peace officer employee records the interrogation. (Gov. Code, § 3303, subd. (g).)

Included in the foregoing is the cost of tape media and storage, and the cost of transcription. Excluded is the investigator's time to record the session and transcription costs of non-sworn and peace officer complainant(s).

The SCO also proposes to delete the word "tape" before "recording" in Section IV. C (4) and (5).

The County of San Bernardino and the City of Sacramento agree with the deletion of the word "tape" in Section IV. C (3), (4), and (5), since they recognize that agencies use other media for recording. Staff agrees and recommends that the Commission adopt the SCO proposal to delete the word "tape."

However, the City of Sacramento contends that the costs to record the interrogation and the transcription costs of peace officer complainants are reimbursable. The City argues as follows:

We have no problem with eliminating the word "tape" concerning recording, as we understand that other agencies use various media for the recordation. However, we want to make clear that the recordation of the interrogation, regardless of the media, is found to be reimbursable.

We do, however, have a problem with excluding the transcription cost of any peace officer complainant(s). When a peace officer complains, that officer is nonetheless afforded POBOR rights, in the event that something he or she says may result in discipline for misfeasance, or more probably, nonfeasance.

Staff finds that the SCO proposed language clarifies that the investigator's time to record the interrogation is not reimbursable. The proposed language is consistent with the record and the Commission's findings in the Statement of Decision. Page 859 of the record is the Commission's Statement of Decision, dated November 30, 1999, on the issue of tape recording the interrogation. Based on testimony of the claimant, the Commission approved reimbursement for tape recording the interrogation when the employee records the interrogation. According to the claimant, a tape recorder is simply placed on a desk by the interrogator during the interrogation.<sup>37</sup> When the claimant submitted its proposed parameters and guidelines, it requested reimbursement for "conducting an interrogation of a peace officer while the officer is on duty."<sup>38</sup> The Commission disagreed that conducting the interrogation was reimbursable. The Commission adopted the staff finding and recommendation that the test claim legislation does not require local agencies to investigate an allegation, prepare for the interrogation, conduct the interrogation, and review the responses given.<sup>39</sup> Thus, reimbursement for the salary of the individual or individuals conducting the interrogation is not reimbursable. The Commission included this finding in the Statement of Decision on reconsideration.<sup>40</sup>

Staff further agrees with the SCO that any costs incurred for non-sworn officers are not reimbursable. By the terms set forth in Government Code section 3301, POBOR expressly applies to "peace officers specified in Sections 830.1, 830.2, 830.3, 830.31, 830.32, 830.33, except subdivision (e), 830.34, 830.35, except subdivision (c), 830.36, 830.37, 830.4, and 830.5 of the Penal Code." The legislation, however, does not apply to reserve or recruit officers,<sup>41</sup> coroners, or railroad police officers commissioned by the Governor. Non-sworn officers, such as custodial officers and sheriff's or police security officers, are not "peace officers."<sup>42</sup> The Legislature has made clear, in Penal Code section 831.4, subdivision (b), that "[a] sheriff's or police security officer is not a peace officer nor a public safety officer as defined in Section 3301 of the Government Code [POBOR]."

Thus, staff recommends that the word "tape" be deleted from Sections IV. (C)(3), (4), and (5), and that Section IV. (C)(3) be further amended as follows:

3. ~~Tape r~~Recording the interrogation when the peace officer employee records the interrogation. (Gov. Code, § 3303, subd. (g).)

~~Included in the foregoing is the~~ The cost of tape media and storage, and the cost of transcription are reimbursable. The investigator's time to record the session and transcription costs of non-sworn and peace officers are **not** reimbursable.

---

<sup>37</sup> Administrative Record, page 873.

<sup>38</sup> Administrative Record, page 965.

<sup>39</sup> Administrative Record, page 912.

<sup>40</sup> Statement of Decision on reconsideration, pages 38 and 39.

<sup>41</sup> *Burden v. Snowden* (1992) 2 Cal.4th 556, 569.

<sup>42</sup> Penal Code sections 831, 831.4.

#### **Section IV. D, Adverse Comment**

Government Code sections 3305 and 3306 provide that no peace officer shall have any adverse comment entered in the officer's personnel file without the peace officer having first read and signed the adverse comment. If the peace officer refuses to sign the adverse comment, that fact "shall" be noted on the document and signed or initialed by the peace officer. In addition, the peace officer "shall" have 30 days to file a written response to any adverse comment entered in the personnel file. The response "shall" be attached to the adverse comment.

As indicated on page 42 of the Commission's Statement of Decision on reconsideration, the Commission, based on the Supreme Court's decision in *San Diego Unified School District v. Commission on State Mandates* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 859, 888-889, denied the activities of obtaining the signature of the peace officer on the adverse comment or noting the officer's refusal to sign the adverse comment, when the adverse comment results in a punitive action protected by the due process clause as follows:

The Commission finds that obtaining the officer's signature on the adverse comment or indicating the officer's refusal to sign the adverse comment, when the adverse comment results in a punitive action protected by the due process clause, are designed to prove that the officer was on notice about the adverse comment. Since providing notice is already guaranteed by the due process clause of the state and federal constitutions under these circumstances, the Commission finds that the obtaining the signature of the officer or noting the officer's refusal to sign the adverse comment is part and parcel of the federal notice mandate and results in "de minimis" costs to local government.

Therefore, the Commission finds that, under current law, the Commission's conclusion that obtaining the signature of the peace officer on the adverse comment or noting the officer's refusal to sign the adverse comment, when the adverse comment results in a punitive action protected by the due process clause is not a new program or higher level of service and does not impose costs mandated by the state. Thus, the Commission denies reimbursement for these activities.

Staff recommends that the Commission amend the parameters and guidelines to delete these activities.

The SCO also proposes to amend the introductory paragraph to Section IV. D, as follows:

~~Perform the following limited activities upon receipt of an adverse comment. The following limited reimbursable activities pertain to peace officers recommended for an adverse comment.~~ (Gov. Code, §§ 3305 and 3306).

The SCO further requests that the following language be added to the end of Section IV. D:

The foregoing relates only to peace officers investigated under POBOR who were subjected to an adverse comment by investigation staff. Reimbursement is limited to activities that occurred subsequent to the completion of a case that resulted in an adverse comment recommendation. Reimbursable activities are limited to providing notice of the adverse comment to the peace officer and providing the officer an opportunity to review, sign, and respond to the adverse

comment. Such activities include a limited review of the circumstances or documentation leading to an adverse comment recommendation by supervisor, command staff, human resources staff, or counsel to determine whether the recommendation constitutes an adverse comment or a written reprimand; preparation and review for accuracy of adverse comment notice; notification and presentation of adverse comment to officer and notification concerning rights regarding the notice; review of officer's response to the adverse comment, and attachment of response to the adverse comment and its filing.

A complaint is not an adverse comment. The foregoing does not include any activities related to investigating a complaint, which is part of the investigative process. Activities such as, but not limited to, determining whether a complaint is valid and may lead to an adverse comment and/or possible criminal offense, interviewing the complainant, and preparing the complaint investigation report are not reimbursable.

Staff finds that the SCO's proposal to limit reimbursement to those activities occurring after an officer is investigated that results in a "recommended" adverse comment is not consistent with the test claim legislation and the Commission's decision on reconsideration. Pursuant to Government Code section 3305, an officer has the right to notice and to provide a response when "any" adverse comment is placed in the officer's personnel file. When interpreting this statute, the Third District Court of Appeal, in *Sacramento Police Officers Association v. Venegas*, concluded that an adverse comment includes any document that creates an adverse impression that could influence future personnel decisions, including decisions that do not constitute discipline or punitive action. The court further found that citizen complaints that are not investigated can be an adverse comment. The court stated the following:

The events that will trigger an officer's rights under those statutes [sections 3305 and 3306] are not limited to formal disciplinary actions, such as the issuance of letters of reproof or admonishment or specific findings of misconduct. Rather, an officer's rights are triggered by the entry of any adverse comment in a personnel file or any other file used for a personnel purpose. [Citation omitted.]

*Aguilar* [v. *Johnson* (1988)] 202 Cal.App.3d 241, addressed the meaning of an adverse comment for the purposes of sections 3305 and 3306 of the Bill of Rights Act. It noted: "Webster defines comment as 'an observation or remark expressing an opinion or attitude ...' (Webster's Third New Intern. Dict. (1981) p. 456.) 'Adverse' is defined as 'in opposition to one's interest: Detrimental, Unfavorable.' (Id. at p. 31.)" (*Aguilar, supra*, 202 Cal.App.3d at p. 249.) Thus, for example, under the ordinary meaning of the statutory language, a citizen's complaint of brutality is an adverse comment even though it was "uninvestigated" and the chief of police asserted that it would not be considered when personnel decisions are made. (*Id.* at pp. 249-250.)

We find the reasoning in *Aguilar* persuasive, as did the Supreme Court in *County of Riverside, supra*, 27 Cal.4th 793. In its usual and ordinary import, the broad language employed by the Legislature in sections 3305 and 3306 does not limit their reach to comments that have resulted in, or will result in, punitive action

against an officer. The Legislature appears to have been concerned with the potential unfairness that may result from an adverse comment that is not accompanied by punitive action and, thus, will escape the procedural protections available during administrative review of a punitive action. As we will explain, even though an adverse comment does not directly result in punitive action, it has the potential of creating an adverse impression that could influence future personnel decisions concerning an officer, including decisions that do not constitute discipline or punitive action. [Citation omitted.]<sup>43</sup>

The Commission noted the *Venegas* case on pages 42 and 43 of the Statement of Decision on reconsideration as follows:

Finally, the courts have been clear that an officer's rights under Government Code sections 3305 and 3306 are not limited to situations where the adverse comment results in a punitive action where the due process clause may apply. Rather, an officer's rights are triggered by the entry of "any" adverse comment in a personnel file, "or any other file used for personnel purposes," that may serve as a basis for affecting the status of the employee's employment.<sup>44</sup> In explaining the point, the Third District Court of Appeal stated: "[E]ven though an adverse comment does not directly result in punitive action, it has the potential for creating an adverse impression that could influence future personnel decisions concerning an officer, including decisions that do not constitute discipline or punitive action."<sup>45</sup> Thus, the rights under sections 3305 and 3306 also apply to uninvestigated complaints. Under these circumstances (where the due process clause does not apply), the Commission determined that the Legislature, in statutes enacted before the test claim legislation, established procedures for different local public employees similar to the protections required by Government Code sections 3305 and 3306. Thus, the Commission found no new program or higher level of service to the extent the requirements existed in prior statutory law. The Commission approved the test claim for the activities required by the test claim legislation that were not previously required under statutory law. [Footnote omitted.] Neither *San Diego Unified School Dist.*, nor any other case, conflicts with the Commission's findings in this regard. Therefore, the Commission finds that the denial of activities following the receipt of an adverse comment that were required under prior statutory law, and the approval of activities following the receipt of an adverse comment that were *not* required under prior statutory law, was legally correct.

Thus, staff recommends that the introductory paragraph identify and clarify the officers that receive the right to notice and to respond to an adverse comment under POBOR as follows:

---

<sup>43</sup> *Sacramento Police Officers Association v. Venegas* (2002) 101 Cal.App.4th 916, 925-926.

<sup>44</sup> *Sacramento Police Officers Assn. v. Venegas* (2002) 101 Cal.App.4th 916, 925.

<sup>45</sup> *Id.* at page 926.

Performing the following activities upon receipt of an adverse comment concerning a peace officer, as defined in Penal Code sections 830.1, 830.2, 830.3, 830.31, 830.32, 830.33, except subdivision (e), 830.34, 830.35, except subdivision (c), 830.36, 830.37, 830.4, and 830.5 (Gov. Code, §§ 3305 and 3306):<sup>46</sup>

Staff further recommends that the end of the adverse comment section clearly identify what is reimbursable and what is not reimbursable as follows:

~~Included in the foregoing are review of circumstances or documentation leading to adverse comment by supervisor, command staff, human resources staff or counsel, including determination of whether same constitutes an adverse comment; preparation of comment and review for accuracy; notification and presentation of adverse comment to officer and notification concerning rights regarding same; review of response to adverse comment, attaching same to adverse comment and filing.~~

The following adverse comment activities are reimbursable:

1. Review of the circumstances or documentation leading to the adverse comment by supervisor, command staff, human resources staff, or counsel to determine whether the comment constitutes a written reprimand or an adverse comment.
2. Preparation of notice of adverse comment.
3. Review of notice of adverse comment for accuracy.
4. Informing the peace officer about the officer's rights regarding the notice of adverse comment.
5. Review of peace officer's response to adverse comment.
6. Attaching the peace officers' response to the adverse comment and filing the document in the appropriate file.

The following activities are **not** reimbursable:

1. Investigating a complaint.
2. Interviewing a complainant.
3. Preparing a complaint investigation report.

#### **Sections IV. and V. Reasonable Reimbursement Methodology**

Upon adoption of the POBOR Statement of Decision on reconsideration, the Commission directed staff to form a working group to develop a reasonable reimbursement methodology to reimburse local governments for state-mandated costs. The California State Association of Counties (CSAC), the County of Los Angeles, and the DOF filed proposals. If the Commission

---

<sup>46</sup> The adverse comment activities do not apply to reserve or recruit officers, coroners, railroad police officers commissioned by the Governor, or non-sworn officers including custodial officers and sheriff or police security officers. (*Burden v. Snowden* (1992) 2 Cal.4th 556, 569; Government Code section 3301; Penal Code sections 831, 831.4.)

adopts a reasonable reimbursement methodology, additional language would be added to Sections IV. and V.

In adopting parameters and guidelines, the Commission may adopt a reasonable reimbursement methodology as defined in Government Code section 17518.5.<sup>47</sup> A reasonable reimbursement methodology is defined in Government Code section 17518.5, as follows:

- (a) "Reasonable reimbursement methodology" means a formula for reimbursing local agency and school district costs mandated by the state that meets the following conditions:
  - (1) The total amount to be reimbursed statewide is equivalent to total estimated local agency and school district costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.
  - (2) For 50 percent or more of eligible local agency and school district claimants, the amount reimbursed is estimated to fully offset their projected costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.
- (b) Whenever possible, a reasonable reimbursement methodology shall be based on general allocation formulas, uniform cost allowances, and other approximations of local costs mandated by the state rather than detailed documentation of actual local costs. In cases when local agencies and school districts are projected to incur costs to implement a mandate over a period of more than one fiscal year, the determination of a reasonable reimbursement methodology may consider local costs and state reimbursements over a period of greater than one fiscal year, but not exceeding 10 years.
- (c) A reasonable reimbursement methodology may be developed by any of the following:
  - (1) The Department of Finance.
  - (2) The State Controller.
  - (3) An affected state agency.
  - (4) A claimant.
  - (5) An interested party.

**Issue 1: Is the CSAC proposal a "reasonable reimbursement methodology," as defined in Government Code section 17518.5?**

Background

CSAC requests that the parameters and guidelines be amended to allow claimants to "calculate the annual claim amount by multiplying the number of peace officers employed by a local agency on January 1 of the claim year by \$528 beginning with the 2006-2007 fiscal year. Subsequent year claims shall be adjusted by the implicit price deflator."

The estimate of \$528 per officer is derived from a report from the SCO and statistics supplied by Peace Officers Standards and Training (POST). According to CSAC, the SCO report includes the name of the claimants who filed POBOR reimbursement claims for fiscal year 2001-2002, the amount each claimant filed, the number of POBOR cases in progress at the beginning of the

---

<sup>47</sup> Government Code section 17557, subdivision (b).

fiscal year and the number of POBOR cases added during the fiscal year. CSAC's analysis considers both cases in progress and cases added during the fiscal year. The total number of sworn officers from POST's year 2000 online statistical report was matched with each claimant. Claimants who were missing either the number of cases or number of sworn officers were eliminated from the analysis. The resulting sample consists of 184 claimants.

For each claimant, CSAC divided the actual amount claimed by the total number of sworn officers to determine the cost per officer. The cost per officer for the 184 claimants was totaled, then divided by 184 to establish the \$528 average cost per officer.

### Comments

The CSAC proposal is supported by the County of Los Angeles and County of San Bernardino and is opposed by the DOF and SCO. The City of Sacramento has "no problem" with this proposal.

DOF believes that the CSAC proposal would result in payments to local governments for activities that were not deemed reimbursable by the Commission. DOF also notes that the proposed reimbursement rate was developed using data contained in unedited claims. DOF cites reviews conducted by the Bureau of State Audits (BSA) and the SCO, finding that a large portion of the costs claimed as reimbursable by local agencies may be invalid and/or unsupported.

SCO's comments are based on the definition of reimbursable activities in the Statements of Decision, final staff analysis to the parameters and guidelines, and parameters and guidelines, and consistent with the position of the BSA in its published 2003 audit report on POBOR. The SCO is concerned that the CSAC proposal is based on "filed claims rather than on reimbursable activities" adopted by the Commission and that as much as 75% of the \$528 rate may be for activities not reimbursable under POBOR.

### Analysis

Staff reviewed the CSAC proposal and its underlying documentation and concludes that it is not a reasonable reimbursement methodology because it does not satisfy the conditions specified in Government Code section 17518.5. The statutory definition of reasonable reimbursement methodology requires that the proposed formula for reimbursing local agency and school district costs mandated by the state meets these conditions:

- (1) The total amount to be reimbursed statewide is equivalent to total estimated ... costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.
- (2) For 50 percent or more of eligible ... claimants, the amount reimbursed is estimated to fully offset their projected costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.

If CSAC's proposed \$528 is applied to 184 eligible claimants and multiplied by 52,914 peace officers employed by these claimants, the total amount to be reimbursed would be approximately \$28 million instead of \$36 million. Adoption of the CSAC proposal would result in the total amount reimbursed being less than the total amount claimed. However, there is no evidence that the total amount that would be reimbursed is equivalent to total estimated claimant costs to implement the mandate in a *cost-efficient manner*. CSAC's proposal is based on actual costs



claimed for the 2001-2002 fiscal year. This is the same fiscal year that is the subject of the 2003 BSA report cited by the SCO and DOF.

The BSA report reviewed the costs claimed for the *Peace Officers Procedural Bill of Rights* mandate. In summary, BSA stated that the local entities reviewed:

Claimed costs under the peace officer rights mandate for activities that far exceed the Commission on State Mandates (Commission) intent.

Lacked adequate supporting documentation for most of the costs claimed under the peace officer rights mandate....

The BSA results in brief stated,

... Based on our review of selected claims under each mandate, we question a high proportion of the costs claimed under the peace officer rights mandate ... In particular, we question \$16.2 million of the \$19.1 million in direct costs that four local entities claimed under the peace officer rights mandate for fiscal year 2001-02 because they included activities that far exceed the Commission's intent. Although we noted limited circumstances in which the commission's guidance could have been enhanced, the primary factor contributing to this condition was that local entities and their consultants broadly interpreted the Commission's guidance to claim reimbursement for large portions of their disciplinary processes, which the Commission clearly did not intend. . . .<sup>48</sup>

The 184 eligible claimants in the CSAC sample claimed a total of \$36,168,183 in fiscal year 2001-2002. The BSA questioned \$16.2 million in direct costs claimed by four audited claimants. This is 45% of the total amount claimed by the CSAC sample used to calculate the \$528 rate. The BSA audit finding provides evidence that the total amount that would be reimbursed under the CSAC formula is not equivalent to total estimated claimant costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner. Thus, staff finds that the CSAC proposal does not satisfy the first condition.

As to the second condition, if 184 eligible claimants are reimbursed \$528/peace officer, more than 75% of the claimants would be reimbursed *more than* the actual amount claimed and receive an over payment of more than \$8 million. Accordingly, staff finds that the amount that would be reimbursed under the CSAC proposal does not fully offset their projected costs to implement the mandate in a *cost-efficient manner* because it would result in overpayment of 75% of the claimants. Thus, staff finds that the CSAC proposal does not satisfy the second condition.

Therefore, staff concludes that the CSAC proposal of \$528/officer is not a reasonable reimbursement methodology because it does not satisfy the conditions required under Government Code section 17518.5.

---

<sup>48</sup> Bureau of State Audits Report, see Administrative Record, page 1412.

**Issue 2: Is the County of Los Angeles proposal a reasonable reimbursement methodology, as defined in Government Code section 17518.5?**

Background

The County of Los Angeles (LA County) requests that the parameters and guidelines be amended to include a reasonable reimbursement methodology that would allow local agencies to be reimbursed based on approximations of local costs mandated by the state. This proposal is based on studies of claims data submitted to the SCO for the 2001-2002 through 2004-2005 fiscal years. LA County describes its proposal as a reimbursement formula which reflects differences in POBOR case loads among local law enforcement agencies and differences in the numbers of peace officers employed by those agencies. The reasonable reimbursement methodology is comprised of three components: (1) *Unit Case Costs* are determined by multiplying (the number of unit level cases) X (12 standard hours) X (productive hourly rate); (2) *Extended Case Costs* are determined by multiplying (the number of extended cases) X (162 standard hours) X (productive hourly rate); and (3) Uniform Costs are determined by multiplying (the number of peace officers) X (standard rate of \$100). The costs from these three components are then totaled for the annual claim amount. Each formula is reviewed below.

**1. Unit Case Costs**

Number of Unit Cases	X	Standard Hours 12	X	Productive Hourly Rate	=	Total
_____				_____		_____

LA County defines a "unit case" as a POBOR case that requires less than 60 hours of reimbursable activities.

LA County conducted a time study from May-October 2004 to measure the amount of time spent on reimbursable POBOR activities<sup>49</sup> for "unit" level cases initiated during May 2004. According to the narrative, the sample size of 44 cases represented approximately 5% of the average unit level cases filed each year for the past five years. Sheriff's case staff was instructed to record time spent on performing "reimbursable activities," as noted in the POBOR parameters and guidelines. LA County checked the time logs to ensure that activity descriptions were appropriately categorized and evaluated them to ensure that the proper activities were time studied.

From this study, LA County reports that time logs on 18 unit-level POBOR cases resulted in the performance of 12 hours of reimbursable activities. The times reported for a unit level case ranged from a low of two hours (120 minutes) to a high of 57.3 hours (3440 minutes).

Based on this time study, LA County proposes that a standard time of 12 hours be used for reimbursement of "unit level cases."

---

<sup>49</sup> Review of the circumstances or documentation which led to initiating the POBOR case; conduct of a POBOR investigation including interrogating the officer and witnesses; preparation and review of the complaint or adverse comment for the officer's review and signature.

## **2 Extended Case Costs**

Number of Extended Cases	X	Standard Hours 162	X	Productive Hourly Rate \$ _____	=	Total _____
-----------------------------	---	--------------------------	---	------------------------------------	---	----------------

An "extended case" is defined as a POBOR case that requires more than 60 hours of reimbursable activities. For fiscal year 2003-2004, LA County employees performed 26,405 hours of reimbursable activities on 163 cases. These hours were claimed under the Reimbursable Component of "Interrogations." LA County divided the total number of hours by the number of cases worked to calculate the proposed standard time of 162 hours for each extended case. The lowest average number of hours for an extended case was reported to be 64 hours of reimbursable activities.

## **3 Uniform Costs**

Number of Peace Officers	X	Standard Rate \$100	=	Total _____
-----------------------------	---	---------------------------	---	----------------

LA County also proposes that each claimant be reimbursed \$100 for each peace officer, employed by the jurisdiction on January 1<sup>st</sup> of the claim year.

## **LA County's Analysis of Summary and Claimant Data**

LA County compared summary data based on its proposal with summary SCO data. The SCO data for four years (2001-2002 through 2004-2005) was reformatted to reflect data in ascending order by claimed costs and cases. (See Schedule 9 on page 8 of LA County's filing, dated June 15, 2006.)

A sample of nineteen additional claimants was developed and costs were calculated based on the application of the reimbursement methodology. The costs were computed by multiplying the number of cases reported to the SCO by the standard times proposed. A productive hourly rate of \$70 was used for unit cases and \$60 for extended cases. It was assumed that 90% of the cases reported to the SCO were unit-level cases and 10% were extended-level cases. (See Schedules 6-7 on pages 10-11 of their filing dated June 15, 2006 for detail.) LA County concludes that of the 19 claimants sampled, reimbursement methodology (RRM) costs for nine claimants were less than those claimed and RRM calculated costs for another nine claimants were more than those claimed. For one claimant, the RRM calculated cost was equivalent to claimed cost.

## **Comments**

The City of Sacramento has "no problems" with the LA County proposal.<sup>50</sup>

The SCO is critical of the entire proposal. In its letter dated August 4, 2006, the SCO comments that the County proposes to apply a methodology to all cities and counties, based on the results

---

<sup>50</sup> See City of Sacramento's Comments filed on August 4, 2005.

of an invalid time study it conducted for unit-level cases and its estimate of time spent for extended (Internal Affairs Bureau) cases.<sup>51</sup>

The SCO does not believe that the LA County's proposed standard time of 12 hours for unit level cases is representative of costs incurred by all cities and counties in California. Furthermore, the time study was not consistent with SCO guidelines or the BSA's standards, as is indicated in the proposal. The time study results were based on only 18 unit-level cases, not the 44 cases selected in the time study plan. Of the 18 cases, only 14 involved POBOR-related activities. Furthermore, SCO believes that only 2.29 hours relate to reimbursable POBOR activities; the remaining hours relate to ineligible activities occurring prior to cases being assigned to a unit-level investigation and ineligible administrative investigative activities.

The SCO comments that in developing the standard time of 162 hours for extended cases and the \$100/peace officer standard rate, LA County did not perform a time study; instead it estimated the investigators' time by applying a ratio of sworn-to-total cases (inclusive on non-sworn employees). The SCO believes that LA County's estimates are not supportable and include ineligible activities.

The DOF concurs with the SCO and also states that the uniform cost of \$100 per peace officer is not based on specific activities or empirical data. DOF asserts that the standard hours and the uniform cost would likely result in payments for non-reimbursable activities.

In rebuttal comments, LA County disagrees with the SCO's belief that for unit cases, only 2.29 hours relate to reimbursable activities. LA County and the SCO disagree as to what activities are reimbursable under the existing parameters and guidelines. In LA County's time study of unit cases, the Sheriff's Department staff logged time spent on "investigations." The SCO maintains that this activity is not reimbursable and this time should not be included in any calculation of reimbursable costs and LA County maintains that it is reimbursable.

#### Analysis

Staff reviewed LA County's proposal and its underlying documentation and concludes that it is not a reasonable reimbursement methodology because it does not satisfy the conditions specified in Government Code section 17518.5. The statutory definition of reasonable reimbursement methodology requires that the proposed formula for reimbursing local agency and school district costs mandated by the state meets these conditions:

- (1) The total amount to be reimbursed statewide is equivalent to total estimated ... costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.
- (2) For 50 percent or more of eligible ... claimants, the amount reimbursed is estimated to fully offset their projected costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.

LA County's proposal is based on three formulas. The first formula consists of a standard time of 12 hours for unit level cases. The 12 hours/unit-level case is derived from LA County's time study which logged time spent on investigation. The SCO reviewed these time logs and concluded that the 12 hours included time spent on ineligible investigative activities. Moreover,

---

<sup>51</sup> See letter from the State Controller's Office, dated August 4, 2006.

in the analysis above of the SCO's proposed amendments to clarify reimbursable activities, staff concurs with the SCO, finding that costs for investigation are not reimbursable. Thus, staff finds that the total amount to be reimbursed statewide under this formula is *not* equivalent to total estimated costs to implement the mandate in a *cost-efficient* manner. Also, staff finds that there is no evidence in the record to determine if the proposed formula would meet the second condition. Therefore, staff concludes that the standard time for unit level cases does not meet the conditions for a reasonable reimbursement methodology.

As to the second formula of a standard time of 162 hours for extended cases, staff also finds that this formula does not satisfy the statutory conditions. First, the standard time of 162 hours per POBOR case is based on LA County's reimbursement claim. LA County claimed costs for review of the circumstances or documentation which led to initiating the POBOR case; conduct of a POBOR investigation including interrogating the officer and witnesses; preparation and review of the complaint or adverse comment for the officer's review and signature. Thus, staff finds that the second formula is also based on non-reimbursable costs. Therefore, staff finds that the total amount to be reimbursed statewide under this formula is not equivalent to total estimated costs to implement the mandate in a *cost-efficient* manner. As to the second condition, there is no evidence in the record to determine if the proposed formula would meet the second condition. Therefore, staff concludes that the standard time for extended level cases does not meet the conditions for a reasonable reimbursement methodology.

As to the third and final formula of a uniform cost allowance of \$100 for each peace officer employed by the jurisdiction on January 1 of the claim year, staff finds that the formula does not satisfy the statutory conditions. Since this uniform rate is not based on any reimbursable activities, there is no way to show that it is equivalent to total estimated costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner, or to fully offset "projected costs to implement the mandate" in a cost-efficient manner. Therefore, staff concludes that the third formula does not meet the conditions for a reasonable reimbursement methodology.

Based on this review, staff finds that LA County's proposed reasonable reimbursement methodology, consisting of three formulas is not a reasonable reimbursement methodology.

**Issue 3: Is the Department of Finance proposal a reasonable reimbursement methodology, as defined in Government Code section 17518.5?**

Background

The DOF requests that the parameters and guidelines be amended to include a reasonable reimbursement methodology. Under DOF's proposal, a distinct "base rate" would be calculated for each claimant based on SCO audited amounts for four years of claims. The annual reimbursement would be the result of multiplying the "base rate" by the number of covered officers. The base rates would be adjusted annually by an appropriate factor to capture the normal cost increases. A process for determining *mean* reimbursement rates would exist while final reimbursement rates are determined.

Comments

Comments were filed on this proposal by the City of Sacramento and the County of Los Angeles. The City of Sacramento commented on the impracticability of having the SCO audit all claimants, especially before the substantial differences in interpretation of the parameters and

guidelines are rectified. The County of Los Angeles believes that auditing all POBOR claims could take considerable time and would be a formidable and expensive task.

In rebuttal comments, DOF recognizes that its proposal would place increased workload on the SCO to audit POBOR claims, and believes the amount of time required is overstated by the City of Sacramento. DOF points out that the County of Sacramento noted that there are 58 counties and 478 cities in California; however, the Controller has only received claims from approximately 250 of these entities. Finance's proposal would require future claimants to be reimbursed at the average of the existing entity specific rates until sufficient claims are available to be audited by the Controller." DOF also states that if there is a new workload requirement for the Controller, the need for additional staff would be reviewed as part of the budget process and DOF would take into account the potential costs and savings.

### Analysis

Staff reviewed the DOF proposal and concludes that it is not a reasonable reimbursement methodology because it does not satisfy the conditions specified in Government Code section 17518.5. The statutory definition of reasonable reimbursement methodology requires that the proposed formula for reimbursing local agency and school district costs mandated by the state meets these conditions:

- (1) The total amount to be reimbursed statewide is equivalent to total estimated ... costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.
- (2) For 50 percent or more of eligible ... claimants, the amount reimbursed is estimated to fully offset their projected costs to implement the mandate in a cost-efficient manner.

The DOF proposes auditing all eligible claimants in order to propose individual base rates or mean reimbursement rates for a reasonable reimbursement methodology. Without a proposed formula (mean reimbursement rate), staff cannot determine if the statutory conditions for a reasonable reimbursement methodology, as defined in Government Code section 17518.5, can be met.

Therefore, staff finds that DOF's proposal is not a reasonable reimbursement methodology as defined in Government Code section 17518.5.

### Conclusion

Based on the evidence in the record, staff recommends denial of the proposed reasonable reimbursement methodologies.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed amendments to the parameters and guidelines for the *Peace Officer Bill of Rights* program, as modified by staff, beginning on page 39.

Staff also recommends the Commission authorize staff to make any non-substantive, technical corrections to the parameters and guidelines following the hearing.